TESTIMONY

of

BOYCE SPINELLI

before the

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

FOR AN

ABBREVIATED FILING

for

PROVIDENCE WATER

June 2002

1	Q.	Please	state	your	full	name	and	title?

2 A. Boyce Spinelli, Deputy General Manager - Administration 3 of the Providence Water Supply Board (Providence Water).

4

- 5 Q. How long have you held the position of Deputy General 6 Manager of the Agency?
- 7 A. I have held this position since January, 2001. Prior to 8 that I was Director of Administration for the City of 9 Providence. From September, 1992 to July, 1999, I was 10 Finance Director for the City of Providence and was an ex-officio member of the Providence Water Supply Board.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Would you please state your education, background and professional associations?
 - A. I graduated from LeMoyne College in Syracuse, New York with a Bachelor of Science in Economics, and completed two years of graduate work in Economics at Washington State University. I have worked in the private sector as well as serving as finance director for three cities in Virginia, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

21

- Q. Have you testified before a regulatory agency with respect to operating matters or rates either in your current position or in your previous positions?
- 25 A. I have testified before the Rhode Island PUC on several occasions in my capacity as finance director for the City of Providence.

- 29 Q. What is the purpose of this filing?
- 30 A. Providence Water is seeking an abbreviated filing to

1		raise rates to cover known and measurable increases in
2		costs.
3		
4	Q.	Why not incorporate these increases in a full filing?
5	Α.	The categories of cost increases addressed in this filing
6		are all eligible for an abbreviated filing.
7		
8		An abbreviated filing is quicker, less complex, and,
9		because Providence Water can do it in house, it is less
10		expensive.
11		
12	Q.	What will the abbreviated filing increase generally
13		cover?
14	Α.	The majority of the increase is for known and measurable
15		changes for salaries and wages, employee benefits, and
16		property taxes. The balance of the increase is for
17		sludge maintenance of our lagoons as described in Paul
18		Gadoury's testimony. There is no requested increase in
19		restricted funding at this time.
20		
21		Our last general rate order was issued for calendar year
22		2001. Since that time, costs have increased and while
23		Providence Water has been able to avoid any additional
24		customer impact by absorbing these increases, we can no
25		longer continue to do so.
26		
27	Q.	Who prepared the documentation in support of this filing?
28	Α.	Providence Water staff has prepared the calculations and
29		testimony necessary for this filing. Jeanne Bondarevskis
30		in the capacity of Finance Director has coordinated the

efforts, and will be testifying on behalf of Providence

Water. In addition, Paul Gadoury, Director of Engineering, Paul Titzmann, Director of Special Projects, and Joseph Spremulli, Director of Support Services, will also be testifying.

Q. When is the proposed rate relief needed to take effect?

A. Providence Water is requesting an effective date of July 31, 2002. This allows for the thirty days required by law. The rate year used in the filing is calendar year 2003. We understand that the Commission will probably issue a suspension to allow for investigation and a hearing; however, a decision that would allow for the new rates to take effect on January 1, 2003, would be appreciated.

Q. Are there any other items being addressed in this filing?

A. Yes. Providence Water is planning to use some of the available fund balance in its insurance restricted fund (which stands at about \$2,837,159) to supplement the reduced insurance amount requested in the proposed water rates contained in the abbreviated filing.

Although the projected insurance expenses for FY 2003 total about \$1.2 million, Providence Water is requesting that \$359,000 be provided by rates, with the remainder being provided by the restricted insurance fund balance.

Using this approach should provide over two years of rate relief to consumers before Providence Water would need to request that full insurance funding be provided by rates.

Q. What is the situation with respect to the increase in the cost for property taxes?

 A. The Town of Scituate recently completed a town-wide revaluation of property values effective December 31, 2000. As a result, Providence Water's property tax bill from Scituate for the period January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001, increased by over \$900,000.

Providence Water applied to the Town of Scituate to have 9,088 acres of forest land classified as forest land for tax purposes consistent with the forest land certificate and designation received by Providence Water from the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (DEM). The Town of Scituate denied Providence Water's application to classify the 9,088 acres as forest land for tax purposes. Providence Water appealed the denial to the Town of Scituate Tax Review Board. The Board has not yet rendered a decision. If not successful with the Tax Review Board appeal, Providence Water will take the matter to the Rhode Island Superior Court.

In addition to appealing the denial of the application for forest land classification, Providence Water has also appealed the valuation of all taxable property located in the Town of Scituate. It is Providence Water's assertion that even if the courts were to rule against the forest land classification, the property in question is grossly overvalued, even without the benefit of the land being classified as forest land. While the appeals are pending, Providence Water is required to pay the full

1		amount of the tax bill.
2		
3	Q.	What is the major category of increased fringe benefit
4		cost, and why?
5		
6	Α.	The major category of increased fringe benefit cost is
7		the contribution by Providence Water to the Employees
8		Retirement System of the City of Providence. There is an
9		increase of \$1,372,378, from \$550,000 to \$1,922,378.
10		
11		The reason for the increase is that in fiscal years ended
12		June 30, 2001, and June 30, 2002, it was necessary for
13		Providence Water to substantially lower the actuarially
14		recommended contribution into the Retirement System.
15		
16		For the three year period, FY 99-01, the City of
17		Providence and the City of Providence School Department
18		contributed 56.35% of the actuarially calculated amount
19		of \$101,331,000, or \$57,104,423. Providence Water, on
20		the other hand, was contributing 100% of its actuarially
21		recommended contribution.
22		
23		As a result, Providence Water was paying more than its
24		fair share. There is no advantage to Providence Water in
25		doing so, as it receives no extra credit in the
26		Retirement System for paying more than its fair share,
27		nor does this reduce future required contributions.
28		Additionally, Providence Water participants in the
29		Retirement System are not entitled to preferential
30		treatment vis-a-vis City and School participants in the

event of a system-wide funding problem, despite paying

100% of its actuarial calculation. Finally, paying more than its fair share is tantamount to subsidizing the general fund of the City of Providence, which is clearly prohibited.

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

1

2

3

4

To bring its retirement contribution in line with the City and School Department, Providence Water lowered its FY 2001 contribution from the budgeted \$2.1 million to \$600,000. In FY 2002, Providence Water contributed \$500,000. As a result of these reduced contributions for FY 2001 and FY 2002, Providence Water is now on the same payment basis as the City of Providence and the School Department. On a going-forward basis, Providence Water will always contribute the exact same percentage of the actuarial calculation as does the City of Providence and the School Department. In FY 2003, the City and the School Department plan to contribute 80% of the actuarial amount, gradually phasing in to 100%. Providence Water will also contribute 80%, which amounts to the \$1,922,387 requested in the filing.

202122

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.